

PPTA ADVISORY PANEL MEETING

MINUTES

NOVEMBER 1, 2005

7:00 PM

SPRINGFIELD INTERCHANGE PROJECT OFFICE

MEETING CALLED BY	PPTA Advisory Panel Final Scheduled Meeting
TYPE OF MEETING	Discussion on I-95/395 HOT/HOV Lane Proposals in Virginia
FACILITATOR	John A. Rollison, III, Special Advisor to the Transportation Secretary
NOTE TAKER	Vickie L. McCrary, Public Involvement Officer
VOTE COUNTER	James Loftus, Innovative Projects, PMP
ATTENDEES	<p>John A. Rollison III, Special Advisor to the Transportation Secretary Katherine Hanley, Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) member, Northern Virginia Julia Connally, CTB member, at-large urban Robert Sevila, CTB member, at-large urban Malcolm Kerley, VDOT Chief Engineer Dennis Morrison, VDOT Northern Virginia District Administrator Dave Ogle, VDOT Fredericksburg District Administrator Charles Badger, Assistant Director, Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation Ron Kirby, Director, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments Alfred Harf, Executive Director, Potomac Rappahannock Transit Commission Brian Smith, University of Virginia Department of Civil Engineering Dan Tangherlini, Director, Washington D.C. Department of Transportation Zeke Newcomb, former CTB member</p> <p>Barbara Reese, VDOT Chief Financial Officer, also a member of the Panel, was not present at this meeting.</p>

Agenda topics: I-95/395 HOT/HOV Lane Proposals from the Clark Team and the Flour Team

[AGENDA TOPIC]	Approval of the October 11, 2005 minutes:
DISCUSSION	Ms Julia Connally chose to abstain from voting, since she was not present on 10/11/05.
CONCLUSIONS	The minutes were approved as presented by all of the other panel members.
[AGENDA TOPIC]	Presentation of data on existing HOV Count Stations.
DISCUSSION:	Report presented by Mr. Richard W. Steeg, Assistant District Engineer, NOVA.
CONCLUSIONS	Studies show that the facilities are approaching capacity.
[AGENDA TOPIC]	Memo from Barbara Reese noting four areas for discussion on the two proposers. The two proposers are Flour-Transurban and Clark/Shirley, also referred to as "the Group". She reminds the panel that their role is not to negotiate but rather to evaluate the information in the proposals also noting that the Flour's asset to liability ratio is significantly lower than the Group's.
DISCUSSION	Four areas covered both proposers' experience, project costs, public transportation investments and financing with main focus on the financial status of both parties.
CONCLUSIONS	Ms. Reese recommends that the Panel move forward with its recommendations to the Commissioner.

[AGENDA TOPIC]	Agenda Item #2: Should the HOV/HOT Lane concept be approved and forwarded to the Commissioner?
DISCUSSION	While both proposals are very detailed, some questions still remain to be answered and a detailed plan is not yet available, but most agreed that the concept does have merit.
CONCLUSIONS	Motion carried that the concept should be approved and moved forward to be presented to the Commissioner. All were in favor.
[AGENDA TOPIC]	Are the proposers qualified to carry out the project?
DISCUSSION	All agree that both parties are very competent and well qualified.
CONCLUSIONS	It was motioned and 2nded that both parties are to be considered qualified to carry out this project.
[AGENDA TOPIC]	Which proposer will the Panel recommend to the Commissioner?
DISCUSSION	Issues put forth for consideration by the various Panel members were both parties' experience in managing a toll road and their differences in equity investments. Some concern was voiced over the southern end of the project's final capacity, the building of general-purpose lanes in the median and how this will affect future needs and the need for sound walls. In regards to cost differences, it was noted that one team believes that there will be 15,000 L.F. of sound walls required while the other foresees the need for up to 74,000 L.F. of sound walls. Both teams are aware that the NEPA process will determine the placement of these sound walls.
CONCLUSIONS	Noting that Flour-Transurban showed more consideration on the overall future of transportation in Northern Virginia, focusing on accessibility and mobility and the integration of their system into a larger system, the panel chose to move forward with presenting the Flour-Transurban proposal to the Commissioner for consideration. There were ten yes's and three votes of no on this motion.
[AGENDA TOPIC]	Advisory Panel 11 (eleven) Draft Findings after review of the legal requirements.
DISCUSSION	Item 1A, Add the words, "travel choices" and eliminate the word "possibly", Item 4, delete the word, "may" and let it just say "satisfies", Item 8B, remove the first sentence beginning with "With revenues..." and let it start with the second sentence.
CONCLUSIONS	All revisions were approved by a majority vote of the panel.
[AGENDA TOPIC]	Recommendations of the Advisory Panel for a Comprehensive Agreement.
DISCUSSION	<p>Environmental and Engineering Section: Depending on the EIS on the Northern and Southern portions of the project, it was noted that the environmental work could take as much as 3 (three) years. Meanwhile, it was recommended that an agreement be entered into the move forward with the traffic and revenue studies. A request that future known transportation needs also be given adequate consideration based on the analysis of the affected groups. It was motioned and 2nded that a "C" be added to giving consideration on minimizing impacts on future improvements in the corridor". Also it was motioned and 2nded that an amendment be added onto Item 12 to include pedestrians and bicyclists. This motion passed with one "no".</p> <p>Financial Section: It was requested that some consideration be giving to Virginia entering into an agreement with the District, pertaining to cost sharing (versus revenue sharing) and maintenance responsibilities for the 14th Street Bridge, which is presently being maintained by the District of Columbia. Some concerns were voiced in regard to the limitations of the Commissioner's abilities to consider such an</p>

agreement. It was noted that a number of such agreements are already in place, i.e., the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

Additional revisions and amendments were made to the wording in this area such as the deleting of the phrase, “and the adjacent roadways and highways ...necessary” from the 3rd thru 5th lines.

Operations:

Item 18 – Traffic Management for the facility is to be integrated and/or coordinated with the existing VDOT traffic management system to include the use of software.

Item 19 – Add the clause “as defined in a transit service plan for the corridor” and then incorporate Item 19 with Item 14.

Item 20 - Substitute the word “priority” for “importance” and replace the term, “net toll revenues” with “revenues remaining after...” to reflect the intent of the clause.

Item 22 – Recommendation that the comprehensive agreement include maintenance of traffic and congestion mitigation measures during construction in the corridor.

No other issues were brought forth for discussion.

The facilitator gave his expression of appreciation to the Panel members for their dedication and expertise and they gave theirs for him, in turn.

CONCLUSIONS

The final meeting of the I-95/395 HOT/HOV Lane Proposals Advisory Panel was then adjourned.